

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
COLUMBIA DIVISION**

KAREN MCNEIL, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

COMMUNITY PROBATION SERVICES,
LLC; *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:18-cv-00033
Judge Campbell/Magistrate Judge Frenzley

JURY DEMAND

PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO SUBSTITUTE

Plaintiffs file this reply to make just two points. First, PSI asserts that Plaintiffs should not be permitted to substitute Ms. Mitchell's estate with respect to Ms. Mitchell's § 1983 damages claims against the company because the Sixth Circuit held that Plaintiffs cannot obtain damages from a private company sued in its official capacity. But the question of whether Plaintiffs can obtain damages from PSI for their § 1983 claims and whether PSI is properly named as a Defendant in the § 1983 damages claims are different questions. PSI did not argue in their summary judgment motion that they should be dismissed from the § 1983 damages claims, and their arguments on that point are inappropriate in response to Plaintiffs' motion to substitute.

CPS Defendants *did* move to dismiss Plaintiffs' § 1983 damages claims against *that* company, and Plaintiffs explained in response that the Court is not required to dismiss CPS as a named Defendant to the constitutional damages claims, and why the relevant factors weigh in favor of keeping CPS as a named Defendant to those claims. *See M.S. ex rel. Hall v. Susquehanna Twp. Sch. Dist.*, 43 F. Supp. 3d 412, 319 (M.D. Pa. 2014) (noting that "a court is not *required* to dismiss [redundant] official capacity claims," and courts routinely exercise their discretion to maintain duplicative or redundant claims at the motion-to-dismiss stage where such claims are valid and dismissing them "will serve no laudable purpose" (internal quotation omitted)); *Doe v. Corr. Corp.*

of Am., No. 3:15-CV-68, 2015 WL 4067765, at *3 (M.D. Tenn. July 2, 2015) (quotations omitted) (citing multiple cases in which courts declined to dismiss official-capacity claims as redundant against the government entity that was also a named defendant); *see generally* Dkt. 387 at 43–47 (explaining that there is no prejudice to CPS of being named in the claims, and the lack of an employer-employee relationship between the County and the company constitutes good reason to keep the company as a named Defendant to those claims to make clear that CPS will continue to have discovery obligations relevant to those claims). All of the practical concerns Plaintiffs articulated for keeping CPS as a named Defendant to the § 1983 damages claims despite the fact that Plaintiffs cannot recover damages directly from the company apply equally to PSI. In any event, a motion to substitute is not an appropriate context for considering dismissing PSI from those claims, especially in light of the fact that PSI had an opportunity to raise that issue in a dispositive motion at the appropriate time and chose not to do so.

Second, PSI expresses confusion about the claims for which Plaintiffs are seeking to substitute Ms. Mitchell’s estate. For clarity, Plaintiffs are seeking to substitute Ms. Mitchell’s estate for Counts 7, 11, 17, 21, and 23 of the Second Amended Complaint. They are not seeking to substitute her estate on Count 2 (Ms. Mitchell’s RICO claim for damages). Plaintiffs inadvertently omitted reference to Count 17 (Ms. Mitchell’s unjust-enrichment claim for damages) in their motion to substitute. Like her other state-law claims, Ms. Mitchell’s unjust-enrichment claim survives because it is a “wrong” under Tennessee’s broad survivorship statute. Tenn. Code Ann. § 20-5-102.

Dated: February 2, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ *Elizabeth Rossi*.

Elizabeth Rossi (*pro hac vice*)

Matthew J. Piers (*pro hac vice*)

Laura Gaztambide Arandes (*pro hac vice*)
Eric Halperin (*pro hac vice*)
Alexandria Twinem (*pro hac vice*)
CIVIL RIGHTS CORPS
1601 Connecticut Ave. NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20009
Telephone: (202) 844-4975
Facsimile: (202) 609-8030
elizabeth@civilrightscorps.org
laura@civilrightscorps.org
eric@civilrightscorps.org
alexandria@civilrightscorps.org

David W. Garrison, BPR 24968
Scott P. Tift, BPR 27592
BARRETT JOHNSTON MARTIN &
GARRISON, LLC
Philips Plaza
414 Union St., Suite 900
Nashville, TN 37219
Telephone: (615) 244-2202
Facsimile: (615) 252-3798
dgarrison@barrettjohnston.com
stift@barrettjohnston.com

Chirag G. Badlani (*pro hac vice*)
Kate E. Schwartz (*pro hac vice*)
HUGHES, SOCOL, PIERS, RESNICK &
DYM, LTD.
70 W. Madison St., Suite 4000
Chicago, IL 60602
Telephone: (312) 580-0100
Facsimile: (312) 580-1994
mpiers@hsplegal.com
cbadlani@hsplegal.com
kschwartz@hsplegal.com

Kyle Mothershead, BPR 22953
The Law Office of Kyle Mothershead
414 Union St., Suite 900
Nashville, TN 37219
Telephone: (615) 982-8002
Facsimile: (615) 229-6387
kyle@mothersheadlaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on February 2, 2021, I electronically filed the foregoing using the CM-ECF System, which caused notice to be sent to all counsel of record who are registered with the CM/ECF system, including the following Counsel for Defendants:

Daniel H. Rader, IV
Moore, Rader, Clift & Fitzpatrick, P.C.
P O Box 3347
Cookeville, TN 38502
(931) 526-3311
Fax: (931) 526-3092
Email: danny@moorerader.com

Brandt M. McMillan
Tune, Entrekin & White, P.C.
315 Deaderick Street
Suite 1700
Nashville, TN 37238
(615) 244-2770
Email: bmcmillan@tewlawfirm.com

Timothy N. O'Connor
Tune, Entrekin, & White, P.C.
315 Deaderick St., Ste. 1700
Nashville, TN 37238-1700
p: (615) 244-2770
Email: toconnor@tewlawfirm.com

Robyn Beale Williams
Farrar & Bates, LLP
12 Cadillac Drive
Suite 480
Brentwood, TN 37027-5366
(615) 254-3060
Fax: (615) 254-9835
Email: robyn.williams@farrar-bates.com

Cassandra M. Crane
Farrar & Bates, LLP
12 Cadillac Drive
Suite 480
Brentwood, TN 37027-5366
615-254-3060
Fax: 615-254-9835
Email: casey.crane@farrar-bates.com

Lucy D. Henson
Lucy D. Henson, PLLC
118 S Second Street
P.O. Box 333
Pulaski, TN 38478
(931) 424-8713
Fax: (931) 424-8715
Email: henson@midsouthlaw.com

s/ Elizabeth Rossi